

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 758

FL 024 781

AUTHOR Bangura, Abdul Karim
TITLE Pedagogy and Foreign Language Teaching in the United States: Andragogy to the Rescue.
PUB DATE 1996-10-00
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Odyssey of the Mind Association International Conference on Nurturing Creativity and Problem Solving in Education (1st, Washington, DC, October 11-13, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Learning; *Andragogy; Educational Objectives; Educational Trends; High Schools; Higher Education; Learning Processes; *Second Language Instruction; *Second Languages; *Teacher Role; *Teaching Methods; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

A discussion of second language education looks at the background of language education, compares perspectives offered by pedagogy and andragogy, and examines texts and syllabi used in high school, undergraduate, graduate, and training curricula. The history of language instruction in the United States is chronicled from the early 1950s, noting commonalities and differences in three major theoretical approaches: structural analysis of language, the notion of deep structure, and lexico-semantic theory. Issues related to language teacher training, common fallacies about language learning, and language teaching techniques and materials are examined. The concepts of pedagogy and andragogy and their underlying assumptions are then compared, noting that andragogy assumes learners to be autonomous and able to identify learning desires and needs and use experience as a major learning resource. It is argued that the nature and outcome of language instruction processes hinge on educators' assumptions about learners' abilities and needs. Results of examination of 31 language textbooks and 25 course syllabi on diverse languages are presented, focusing on shortcomings in approach, design, and instructional techniques. It is concluded that the autonomy, self-directedness, and creativity encouraged by the principles and practices of andragogy are the characteristics most needed in language learners. Contains 50 references. (MSE)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

PEDAGOGY AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE UNITED STATES: ANDRAGOGY TO THE RESCUE

**Abdul Karim Bangura
Bowie State University
The African Institution**

fL024781
Paper presented at the Odyssey of the Mind Association's First International Conference on Nurturing Creativity and Problem Solving in Education held at the Hyatt Regency on Capitol Hill in Washington, DC, October 11-13, 1996.

Introduction

The growth of the academic study of foreign languages in the United States has seesawed since the end of the Second World War in 1945 as federal dollars were invested in training programs so that the United States would be able to cope with post-World War II era challenges. Most of this money went to major research universities. Consequently, the training in foreign languages that evolved at these institutions was rooted in the historical development of Western language disciplines, the history of race and power in America, and the hegemonic control over discourse on languages in America.

That the study of foreign languages has evolved over time is hardly a matter of dispute. By and large, this evolution has implications for the desirable content of foreign language education. What is not so generally recognized is that the evolution of the study of foreign languages may also have implications for the *process* of foreign language study. The teaching and learning *context and process*--as well as the curricular content--teach. Not only *what* is taught, but *how* it is taught should be formed with our educational goals clearly in mind.

The educational goals of foreign language study should be many: (a) to have the very best non-native foreign language speakers possible; (b) to have these speakers well trained in the history and cultures of the native speakers of the languages; (c) to have these speakers as well prepared for their professions and careers as possible; (d) and to have these speakers be able to continue to learn as their jobs, professions, and fields change during their professional careers. Notions of the educational content which these goals call for have varied during the evolution of foreign language study. However, it appears that approaches to the process of learning have not changed much during this evolutionary period. It is necessary, therefore, to reflect on the educational goals, consider the peculiarities of the educational tasks and challenges, and rethink the approach to foreign language study as carefully as the content of that education.

Thus, the aim of this essay is to focus on the issue of desirable educational processes for the best foreign language education. To be discussed in this essay are (a) the background of foreign language education, (b) the perspectives offered by the pedagogy/andragogy distinction, and (c) evidence gleaned from some foreign

language texts and course syllabi used for high school, undergraduate, graduate and training institute curricula throughout the United States. At the end, suggestions as to the educational processes that seem most compatible with foreign language study will be drawn from the discussion.

The Background of Foreign Language Education

The training of foreign language teachers in the United States since the 1950s has been driven by three theoretical approaches. The first approach is Fries' structural view (1952). His idea of the structure of English within a structural perspective of language considers sentences as patterns of word classes into which are inserted individual words in the phonemes of the language. This structural linguistic view is concerned not with the native speaker's competence but with the description and teaching of languages.

The second approach is Chomsky's deep structure (1965). Unlike Fries, Chomsky attempted to explain the competence of an ideal native speaker as an innate syntax (i.e. deep structure) from which the speaker derives by transformational generative rules a surface structure on which are inserted words and sounds. Chomsky's approach represents a major revolution in the theory of language, but it is not meant to be a theory of language learning. However, his language acquisition hypothesis has been employed by proponents of second language acquisition on the model of first language acquisition to support sweeping methods claim. For example, Krashen and Terrell (1983) propose that only acquisition experiences contribute to competence, not learning experience.

The third approach is Lado's lexico-semantic theory (1990). Unlike Fries and Chomsky, Lado contended that lexical and semantic, rather than syntactic, items more adequately explain the acquisition of language by prelingual, preliterate children and the learning of a second language by adults. Lado claimed that humans acquire and learn words, names, titles, expressions, sayings, and formulae as undifferentiated lexical items (lexemes) first. According to him, as the number of lexemes increase to meet the communicative, expressive, emotional, and aesthetic needs of the language learner, the memory load becomes heavy and triggers the

development of systems to store and retrieve them as needed and to combine them in phrases and sentences. In addition, Lado suggested that these systems develop according to the cognitive capabilities and skill potential of humans.

Syntax is central in both Fries and Chomsky's postulates and lexeme is pivotal in Lado's. Significant differences between Fries and Chomsky's theories hinge on the level at which word classes and words are inserted and in the pedagogical interest of structural linguistics, which is missing in transformational grammar. Fries' patterns have greater pedagogical interest than Chomsky's rules, while Chomsky's deep structure is deeper and his rules are more powerful than those of Fries. For Lado, a learner breaks into a second language at the level of words, with transfer of native language sounds, morphology, and syntax until the second language systems are learned or acquired.

In essence, Fries viewed native speakers as learners who develop the patterns of language habits and insert vocabulary as needed for communication. Chomsky viewed humans as learners who possess a language acquisition device endowed with innate syntax and programmed to acquire perfect language competence from imperfect samples. Lado viewed the acquisition of a second language within the precept of child language which develops words first, and then progresses simultaneously up to groups of words which become phrases and sentences, and down from the words to parts of words and phonemes.

Furthermore, as Ka (1995:92) has pointed out, two major objectives have been generally pursued in the teaching of foreign languages in the United States. One is typically instrumental, or utilitarian, i.e. the foreign language is learned in order to help sell products, compete in new markets, or protect strategic or political interests. This objective is usually invoked by government and industry. The second objective belongs to a humanistic tradition, i.e. learning a foreign language should serve to promote understanding between cultures and between peoples. This is the objective most often invoked by educators and educational institutions. Given the sharp contrast between the two objectives, it is not surprising to find a constant tension between them.

Ka (1995:92) also suggested that since most educators would agree that languages should be taught first for their intrinsic humanistic value, it is worth examining specific objectives that language teachers may assign themselves. The first objective

is to teach how to communicate in the language. This is the most recognized foreign language teaching objective since the advent of the grammar-translation approach. The second objective is to teach about the cultures of the speakers of the languages. Many foreign language teachers have traditionally assumed that the first objective should have a much higher priority than the second one. The fundamental issue, however, is whether much more emphasis should be placed on the second objective. The reasons for such an emphasis are related to the specific position of foreign languages and cultures in the United States. In light of the widespread ignorance or misunderstanding of many foreign cultures, and the lack of opportunity to interact in many foreign languages, it behooves educators to stress the parallel teaching of linguistic and cultural aspects, as opposed to the sole teaching of linguistic skills that the student may have few opportunities to put into practice. This, of course, calls for a change in the way foreign languages are being taught, from a drill-oriented approach to a culture-focused approach.

It is not surprising, therefore, that three major issues have impinged on foreign language education in the United States. These issues include: (1) the teacher of foreign languages, (2) the fallacies in relation to learning foreign languages, and (3) the techniques and materials used in foreign language teaching.

The teacher of foreign languages in the United States teaches his/her subject predominantly in college; teachers of foreign languages in graduate schools are a very small fraction of the total number, and the number of teachers of foreign languages in training institutes, elementary and secondary schools a still smaller one.

The training institute instructor or college teacher of foreign languages has probably received his/her appointment after receiving a master's or doctoral degree in his/her foreign language at one of a small number of universities, and s/he might have done some teaching of the language as a graduate assistant. In an overwhelming majority of cases, however, s/he has never had any courses addressed to methods of teaching foreign languages.

The primary or high school teacher of foreign languages has presumably had a course in methods, this being a prerequisite in most states for teacher certification. But the methods course is often lacking in content. The students are likely to be a conglomeration of present or future teachers of a variety of languages; textbooks for the course are few, and of those that are available, many are outdated and some are

too general--that is, they make amiable generalizations about the teaching of foreign languages.

The three fallacies which exist in terms of the learning of foreign languages in general, noted by linguist John Hughes (1968:6-7) twenty-eight years ago, have and continue to unduly impede the successful learning of foreign languages by Americans. The first fallacy is that there is such a thing as a "talent" for learning foreign languages, lacking in most Americans, and in the absence of which the student might as well not attempt such an impossible task. But as Hughes has argued, no evidence for such an assumption exists. This is because, according to him, every normal human being has sufficient talent for languages to learn at least one--his/her own. The learning process used for acquiring one's native language, Hughes admitted, cannot, of course, be duplicated in school. But, he noted, one must also consider the fact that one learns his/her native language as an infant, when s/he has far less ability to learn or practice in learning. Moreover, Hughes added, many persons who fail language courses in school--presumably due to their lack of talent--subsequently acquire a fluent command of the same language under special circumstances, such as marrying a speaker of that language.

The second fallacy is the belief that non-European languages are more "difficult" to learn than European languages. As Hughes argued, the principal obstacle to learning a second language (besides the method of teaching used) seems to be the interference of the learner's native language. Thus, he suggested, the difficulty any language presents to a learner is evidently in inverse ratio to its similarity to the learner's native language. Hughes concluded that it follows, of course, that no language is *in itself* easy or difficult to learn.

The third fallacy is the assumption that mastering a foreign language requires, and is evidence of, superior intelligence. On this point, Hughes argued that a moment's reflection will show that even morons succeed in learning their mother tongues better, in fact, than perhaps a majority of high school students learn a second language. So, he concluded, intelligence is evidently not a barrier to *practical* mastery of a language--that is, a minimum level of skill adequate for carrying on the affairs of everyday life.

Also, the methods of foreign-language teaching in general, which Hughes (1968:4) identified, are still prevalent today in foreign language teaching. These

methods can be classified into two categories. The first are the grammar-translation methods (which predominate in the schools) which assume that a foreign language can only be understood by first translating it into English. The second are the direct-association methods (also used in schools, but less widely) which are based on the premise that the student must learn to associate a concept--that is, a thought--directly with the word in the foreign language, without the intervention of any English word; this is also referred to as thinking in the foreign language.

In addition, the changes in foreign language teaching in general, which Albert Valdman (1966:xv) observed almost three decades ago, appear relevant even today. Despite the installation of more than 8,000 language laboratories, the development of new materials, and the use of a wide variety of teaching aids, it might perhaps still be premature to speak of a "revolution" in foreign language instruction in the United States. Foreign language teaching techniques and materials employed in this country can be characterized by: (a) an emphasis on audiolingual skills--that is, comprehension and speaking ability; (b) the assimilation of conversational-style target language texts through mimicry and memorization; (3) the presentation of authentic target language samples by the use of live native speakers in class or recordings in the language laboratory; (d) the learning of pronunciation and grammar through pattern drills; (e) a claimed application of structural (or scientific) linguistics to language teaching problems.

According to Valdman (1966:xix), the most serious shortcoming of these teaching techniques and materials is that they constitute a closed system. The student learns a finite stock of basic sentences which s/he can parrot if the proper circumstances present themselves; at best s/he can only be expected to vary the sentences by inserting lexical items in the slots of the pattern drills s/he has manipulated. Valdman also pointed out that experiments in language acquisition by children suggest that humans do not learn their first language by *mim-mem* (mimicry-memorization), but that they construct from their linguistic environment a model which can be projected beyond what has been heard in the past to form and recognize new combinations.

The Pedagogy/Andragogy Distinction

Balfour and Marini (1991:478-485) have summarized the fundamental distinction between pedagogy and andragogy. The discussion in this section draws a great deal from their analytical framework.

Over the last twenty-five years, some adult education specialists have adopted the term "andragogy" for the philosophy, principles, and practices that they have found most useful in tackling the special learning needs and characteristics of adult learning. These specialists have made a distinction in the adult education literature between pedagogy (an approach to education allegedly based on assumptions of student-as-child) and andragogy (an approach to education based on assumptions of student-as-adult). Indeed, as education specialist Popie Marinou Mohring (1990) has pointed out, this distinction is problematic in the sense that the pejorative meaning ascribed to pedagogy undermines its older and well-established meaning which neither focuses exclusively on children nor emphasizes the characteristics ascribed to it in the andragogy literature.

Although problematic, the way the pedagogy concept has been treated in the adult education literature is not without justification. A great deal of evidence exists in American education at all levels to support the characterization. It is probably best to treat the terms pedagogy and andragogy as the adult education literature has used them like "pure types" or "ideal types" in the Weberian sense, or "models" as the concept is commonly employed in contemporary social science. This will allow one to view the two concepts as extreme positions on a continuum of approaches to teaching, where no one teacher's approach is likely to be an unadulterated or complete example of either of the concepts.

As shown in Table 1, the basic difference between pedagogy and andragogy is that between treating learners as passive and dependent individuals and treating them as relatively autonomous and self-directed individuals. Education specialist Malcolm Knowles (1984) has noted that much of what is commonly conceptualized as education and teaching is the outcome of attempts to transmit knowledge and culture to children under conditions of compulsory attendance. Knowles (1970, 1984) and other scholars in the adult education domain (Bright 1989, Brookfield 1986, and Ingalls 1973) saw pedagogy as a method which developed in such a context and to

have inappropriately permeated all of education, including adult education. Pedagogy, then, is problematic for foreign language education not so much because its assumptions may be oriented towards the learning needs of children as because they are associated with specific educational objectives and settings. Consequently, pedagogy does not provide a comprehensive model for learning foreign languages either by children or adults. Specifically, pedagogy is aimed at transmitting knowledge to learners who are presumed not to have the means or ability to learn on their own. It is characterized by a relationship of dependency between teacher and learner, where the latter is mostly passive and is taught by, or learns from, the former. Pedagogy assumes that the learner lacks relevant knowledge and experience and generally is incapable of determining the learning or educational agenda. As such, the agenda is to be set by the teacher or educational institution. This educational agenda, according to Brookfield (1986), is based on subjects sequenced in terms of level of difficulty and the skill level of the learner.

Table 1
Basic Assumptions of Pedagogy and Andragogy

Pedagogy	Andragogy
Dependent learner	Autonomous learner
Learner lacks relevant experience	Learner's experience is a major learning resource
Teacher/Institution sets the agenda	Learner can identify his/her learning desires and needs
Prepare for the future	Solve today's problems

Pedagogy is familiar to most of us from at least part of our early school days. It probably can be effective and appropriate, given certain educational goals, participants, settings, and subject matter. Also, it can be applied to both children and adults. However, it cannot address every individual's learning desires and needs. Most adults, and even some children, can not only learn various subjects from their teachers but also can take an active role in identifying and effectively pursue their own learning agenda.

The basic assumption of andragogy is that adults have a preference for self-direction in learning. As a learner matures and develops an autonomous sense of self, s/he tends to shun dependency relationships. This andragogical model, as presented by Ingalls (1973), takes into consideration the autonomy of mature adults and their drive to continue the learning process. A corollary to this assumption is that the accumulated experience of learners is a valuable learning resource that should be integrated into the educational process. The learning content of andragogy is determined by the learners in collaboration with their teacher or facilitator because of the autonomy, desire to learn, and experience of the former. This agenda calls for solving problems or pursuing interests in the learner's immediate environment.

Several implications can be delineated because of the fundamental difference between pedagogy and andragogy. The first of these, following Ingalls (1973) and Knowles (1984), has to do with the power relation between teacher and learner. While andragogy makes less of a distinction between teacher and learner, pedagogy emphasizes a dominant teacher and a dependent and passive learner. The andragogy teacher acts like a facilitator or resource for the learner and also acts as an active learner in the process. In pedagogy, communication is one-way directional: from teacher to learner. Andragogy, on the other hand, encourages integrative learning.

The second implication is that in pedagogy, as Ingalls (1973) noted, the teacher unilaterally decides *what* is to be learned and *how* it is to be learned in the belief that the learners are incapable of identifying their learning needs. In andragogy, the learners themselves directly and significantly influence the curriculum based on their interests and needs. The role of the teacher in andragogy becomes that of a facilitator to help learners form interest groups and diagnose their learning needs. Andragogy allows learners to manage and direct this collaborative process.

Finally, as Knowles (1984), Ingalls (1973), and Brookfield (1986) maintained,

pedagogy treats education more in terms of preparation for the future than as a matter of doing in the present. An implied distinction exists between the world of learning and that of doing. Andragogy assumes that learning is central to what it means to be human. Consequently, very little distinction is made between learning and doing, between education and everyday problem-solving. Andragogy calls for identifying and solving problems in the present. It looks at the present situation and attempts to define and pursue concrete goals.

In sum, the nature and outcome of a foreign language educational process will hinge on the assumptions that educators hold about the abilities and needs of the learners. Pedagogy can sensibly be employed if it is believed that foreign language learners are dependent and passive and would not learn in the absence of steady direction from the teacher. On the other hand, andragogy can sensibly be used when educators believe that foreign language learners are basically autonomous, self-directed, and motivated to learn.

As Knowles (1973) reminded us, the assumptions educators hold about learners can become self-fulfilling prophecies. Learners in a foreign language pedagogic setting can become passive in the classroom largely because that is how they have been socialized to behave. Adults can become ambivalent about becoming involved in the educational or training experience for fear that they will be treated as though they lack the maturity and experience to contribute to the learning process.

Evidence from Foreign Language Texts and Course Syllabi

The evidence presented in this section is based on the examination of thirty-one foreign language textbooks and twenty-five foreign language course syllabi currently being used by a number of foreign language teachers and trainers throughout the United States. The textbooks comprised the following: two on Temne spoken in Sierra Leone (Marvin et al 1965, Coleman 1967); one on Swahili spoken in Burundi, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zaire (Hinnebusch and Mirza 1979); one on Amharic spoken in Ethiopia (Leslau 1968); two on Greek (Betts and Henry 1989, Joint Association of Classical Teachers 1978); two on Latin (Sidwell 1995, Ashley, Fiesel and Lashbrook 1974); one on Dutch (Koolhoven

1992); two on Russian (Dawson and Humesky 1965, Kostomarov 1986); three on Arabic (Abboud and McCarus 1968, McCarus and Rammuny 1974, Ryding, Owais and Zaiback 1990); three on Italian (Zappala 1985, Speight 1962, Gagliardi and Melchionna 1976); four on Spanish (Dominicis and Reynolds 1994, Andrian 1969, Ayllón and Smith 1968, Lamadrid, Bull, and Briscoe 1974); one on Japanese (Inoue 1991); one on Hebrew (Harrison 1955); two on Swedish (Beite et al 1963, Wijk-Andersson 1978); three on German (Vail and Sparks 1967, 1971, Sparks and Reichmann 1972); and seven on French (Bragger and Shupp 1978a, 1978b, Brown 1977, Dietiker 1978, Gourévitch and Stadler 1975, Comeau, Bustin and Lomourex 1977, Bragger and Rice 1988). While these textbooks are not representative of all that is available on foreign language instruction in the United States, they are, nevertheless, not atypical.

Taken together, three major characteristics seem to be prevalent in these textbooks. First, learners are presented with the sort of dialogues that the authors believe these students may actually be involved in under given circumstances in the foreign country. These dialogues are framed in a way that they can be attacked with a "mim-mem" approach: that is, mimicry and memorization; the learners are to imitate the dialogue (at first in chorus, to obviate self-consciousness) until a teacher or native speaker can be satisfied that their pronunciation is easily comprehensible, then commit the dialogue to memory, so that they can automatically give the answer to any question or, given the situation, ask the question.

Second, the grammar-translation method starts with written texts. Students are to be led to the writing through intermediate transcriptions in a quasi-phonetic script based on the English letter values, and only after several weeks of exclusively oral work during which the fundamentals of the foreign language has been mastered. A phrase-and-sentence approach is to be used, keyed to specific situations which could readily be imagined. Pronunciation is to be taught by imitation, plus necessary explanations by the teacher.

Consequently, most of the grammar of the foreign language is stated in terms of a very small number of basic sentence patterns; the cases of words, for instance, are to be seen in relation to the sentence--they exist for the sake of indicating functions in the sentence, rather than as phenomena to be learned as an end in themselves. The outcome of this type of approach is subconscious learning that will eventually, after

much practice, be transferred to the subconscious. Employing this approach, the learner, switching from the second person pronoun to the first, will also switch the verb form without being aware that s/he is doing so. This manipulation of sentences to bring out grammar, called "pattern practice," is a major feature of the audiolingual technique. One principal difficulty it entails is that it requires a relatively large amount of exercises to generate a relatively small amount of grammar.

Finally, in the teaching of pronunciation, the alphabet of the foreign language and a run down of the list, letter by letter, is provided, explaining how each letter is to be pronounced. The explanations are not too sophisticated and tend to divide the letters into those to be pronounced exactly or more or less like English and those whose sounds can be learned only from a native speaker.

The shortcomings of this method are quite obvious. Practically every European language has adopted an alphabet originally designed for the writing of Latin, and in practically all languages--even Italian, the closest to Latin--there are sounds for which the Latin alphabet had no letters, which may have to be represented by diographs, or not being represented at all, it being simply understood that a certain letter has a special pronunciation in certain circumstances. Moreover, the same sound may be expressed by two or more letters. Thus, telling how English letters sound in foreign languages is not likely to give the learner a clear idea of the pronunciation of those languages.

Furthermore, there is very little variation in the way the twenty-five foreign language course syllabi examined are designed. The typical course design is represented in Table 2.

From the course design in Table 2, it is obvious that the methods used in teaching foreign languages have generally been of the traditional type, i.e. they take a grammar-translation approach (or its equivalent), and they demonstrate an overreliance on the textbooks. Such methods are likely to have a negative impact on students' motivation and performance: learning a foreign language becomes learning just another set of grammar rules which the student may never have the opportunity to put into practice in actual conversation.

Table 2
Foreign Language Course Design

1. Dialogue
2. Cultural Notes (wherever relevant)
3. Grammatical Notes
4. Exercises:
 - (a) Discrete Point Drills (i.e. grammatical point drills)
 - (b) General Comprehension (i.e. integrative) Exercises
 - (c) Unit-Extrapolated Exercises--Reading and Translation; Reading, Questions/Answers, Dictation, Transformations
5. Glossary (new vocabulary from unit)
6. Short Video Segments

To avoid these pitfalls, foreign language teachers need to take into account the backgrounds of their students; many come to language classes with a thin knowledge of the grammar of their own language, not to mention a foreign language: teaching them the inner workings of, e.g., noun class systems may not do them much good in terms of actually helping them use nouns and distinguish them from verbs. Students may also come to the language classroom with differing learning styles: some are more visual, others are more auditory, still others are more kinesthetic.

If all this is not enough to make the case for the employment of andragogy in foreign language teaching, consider, for example, a survey of students' interests and motivations for studying African languages conducted by Schuh (n.d.). The diversity of interests and motivations the students brought with them, as revealed by the survey, are presented in Table 3.

In light of this diversity of interests and motivations, one may appreciate the difficulty of elaborating materials and methods that would be appropriate for each category. Note, however, the first place given to interest in African culture: this supports the argument that teaching about foreign culture should be at least as important as teaching purely linguistic skills when designing the foreign language curriculum.

Conclusion

Indeed, it is imperative and urgent for foreign language education in the United States to be concerned about broader education as well as training and to be concerned about approaches to learning and teaching which are compatible with and conducive to the kind of non-native foreign language speakers needed today and in the future. Non-native foreign language speakers are needed who

- (a) can deal with linguistic and cultural changes, uncertainties, and ambiguities;
- (b) are sensitive to and capable of working with diverse values;
- (c) will continue learning and developing their foreign language skills;
- (d) can work with colleagues and facilitators in constructive and open ways while sustaining a strong sense of character, ethics, and professional commitment;
- (e) are flexible, open minded, and capable of finding new information on their own, absorbing new information and insights, and correcting their paths when what they learn calls for that; and
- (f) are largely self-directed, creative, and have a proper sense of autonomy as well as responsibility.

Table 3
Students' Interests and Motivations
for Studying African Languages

1. Interest in African culture/continent
2. Field research in Africa
3. Part of degree requirements
4. To fulfill university language requirement
5. Required in order to receive fellowship
6. Easy admission/easy grading
7. International trade
8. African boyfriend/girlfriend

If the primary purpose of foreign language educational processes is to help learners become such non-native foreign language speakers, it is obvious that andragogic approaches must be built into the procedures for fulfilling our educational responsibilities. Teachers must be sensitive to the socialization effects and self-fulfilling nature of different educational assumptions, philosophies, principles, and practices. Foreign language programs do not want to teach learners to act as mindless cogs in academic machinery of common characterization.

Non-native foreign language learners cannot afford to function according to the behavioral and intellectual patterns of dependence and passivity that are encouraged and inculcated by pedagogic assumptions, principles, and practices. To the contrary, the autonomy, self-directedness, and creativity encouraged by the principles and

practices of andragogy are the characteristics most needed in the next generation of non-native foreign language learners. When andragogy is considered along with the idea of the socialization effects of educational environments and the possibilities of a reinforcement of these notions and contexts, the implications for foreign language education appear vital.

There also exists a larger reality: that is, the present global situation is characterized by transitions in different domains--political, economic, social, cultural. The current political climate in the United States, for example, does not seem very favorable to the development of foreign language teaching. Indeed, while there are 'push' forces (for instance, the world economic environment and the competition for new markets) which encourage foreign language learning, there also are 'pull' forces (fueled by persistent budget deficits, institutional retrenchment, and a growing xenophobia) which would like to restrict foreign language teaching. In this context, advocates of foreign language instruction need to remain vigilant, and most of all to be innovative in their efforts to encourage the learning of these languages.

References

Abboud, P. F. and E. N. McCarus. 1968. *Elementary modern standard Arabic*, I. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Andrain, G. W. 1969. *Modern Spanish prose*. London: Macmillan Co.

Ashley, C. W., R. Fiesel and A. M. Lashbrook. 1974. *Living Latin: A contemporary approach*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Ayllón, C. and P. Smith. 1968. *Spanish composition through literature*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Balfour, D. L. and F. Marini. 1991. Child and adult, X and Y: Reflections on the process of public administration education. *Public Administration Review*, 51, 6.

Beit, A-M et al. 1963. *Basic Swedish grammar*. Stockholm: Gotlab.

Betts, G. and A. Henry. 1989. *Ancient Greek: A complete course*. Chicago, IL: NTC Publications Corporation.

Bragger, J. D. and R. P. Shupp. 1978a. *Le monde FranÇais*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co.

Bragger, J. D. and R. P. Shupp. 1978b. *Chère Françoise*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co.

Bragger, J. D. and D. B. Rice. 1988. *ALLONS-Y: Le Français par étapes*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Bright, B. P. 1989. *Theory and practice in the study of adult education: The epistemological debate*. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Brookfield, S. D. 1986. *Understanding and facilitating adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, T. H. 1977. *French*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Coleman, W. L. 1969. *Temne short basic course*, rev ed. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Comeau, R. F., F. L. Bustin and N. J. Lamoureux. 1977. *Culture et société*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Dawson, C. L. and A. Humesky. 1965. *Modern Russian*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Dietiker, S. R. 1978. *En bonne forme*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co.

Dominicis, M. C. and J. J. Reynolds. 1994. *Repase y escriba*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Fries, C. C. 1952. *The structure of English*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Gagliardi, L. and I. Melchionna. 1976. *Italian grammar for beginners*. Napoli: Publigraf.

Gourévitch, D-J and E. M. Stadler. 1975. *Premiers textes littéraires*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Harrison, R. K. 1955. *Biblical Hebrew*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd.

Hinnebusch, T. J. and S. M. Mirza. 1979. *Swahili*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Hughes, J. P. 1968. *Linguistics and language teaching*. New York: Random House.

Ingalls, J. D. 1973. *A trainer's guide to andragogy*, rev ed. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Inoue, K. 1991. *Hello in Japanese, Vols. I & II*. Union City, CA: Heian International Inc.

Joint Association of Classical Teachers. 1978. *Reading Greek*. New York: Cambridge University Press,.

Ka, O. 1995. African language instruction in the United States: Old challenges, new ideas. Paper presented at the African Language Studies in Transition Conference, University of Maryland Eastern Shore, Maryland, September 28-30.

Knowles, M. 1970/1980. *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*. New York: Cambridge Books.

Knowles, M. 1984. *The adult learner: A neglected species*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Co.

Koolhoven, H. 1992. *Dutch: A complete course*. Chicago, IL: NTC Publications Corporation.

Kostomarov, V. 1986. *Russian for everybody*. Moscow: Russky Yazyk Publishers.

Krashen, S. D. and T. D. Terrell. 1983. *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Hayward, CA: The Alemany Press.

Lado, R. 1990. Toward a lexico-semantic theory of language and language learning. *The Georgetown Journal of Languages and Linguistics* 1, 1.

Lamadrid, E. E., W. E. Bull and L. A. Briscoe. 1974. *Communicating in Spanish*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Leslau, W. 1968. *Amharic textbook*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

McCarus, E. and R. Rammuny. 1974. *A programmed course in modern literary Arabic phonology and script*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Department of Near Eastern Studies.

Mohring, P. M. 1990. Andragogy and pedagogy: A comment on their erroneous usage. *Human Resource Development* 1, 1.

Ryding, N. O. and A. Zaiback eds. 1990. *Formal spoken Arabic: Classic course*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Schuh, R. n.d. African language teaching and research in Europe and North America. Los Angeles: University of California Los Angeles.

Sidwell, K. 1995. *Reading medieval Latin*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sparks, K. and E. Reichmann. 1972. *So ist es!* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Speight, K. 1962. *Italian*. New York: David McKay Co.

Vail, V. H. and K. Sparks. 1967. *Der weg zum lessen*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Vail, V. H. and K. Sparks. 1971. *Modern German*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Valdman, A. ed. 1966. *Trends in language teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Wijk-Andersson, K. L. 1978. *Säg det på Svenska*. Uppsala: Merkantil-Trykeriet AB.

Wilson, W. A. A. 1961. *An outline of the Temne language*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

Zappala, S. 1985. *Mastering Italian*. Washington, DC: Barron's Educational Service.

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on
Languages & Linguistics
1118 22nd Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20037

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

~~ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598~~

~~Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com~~

*07/08/05
02/17/81*